

MRS. ELIZABETH BLISS WOLF.

[To accompany Bill H. R. No. 685.]

---

MAY 4, 1860.

---

Mr. DELANO, from the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, made the following

REPORT.

*The Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Elizabeth Bliss Wolf, asking for the pension to which she is entitled for the services of her first husband, Elijah Bliss, and of her second husband, Frederick Wolf, in the revolutionary war, report :*

That the present applicant for relief is aged eighty-eight years, and it is now twelve years since she first presented her claim to the Pension office. She claimed in the twofold right, viz: under her first husband, Elijah Bliss, to whom she was married May 1, 1792, and who died in the year 1797; and, secondly, under her second husband, Frederick Wolf, whom she married in the year 1800, and who died January 20, 1837.

She offers proof of the services of both husbands as revolutionary soldiers, and we have no doubt that each did serve in such capacity, for a longer or shorter period, though for what precise period the evidence does not clearly demonstrate.

The declaration on oath of the petitioner and her children, as well as of certain aged witnesses, in nowise related to the applicant, contemporaries of Bliss, and well acquainted with him, that he was from the earliest period subsequent to this war reported to be a soldier of the revolution, and to have served in the battles of Monmouth and White Plains, we think renders abundantly probable the fact of *some service*, and that he was wounded in the service; and it is by no means improbable that he was the identical soldier bearing the same name who was returned on the rolls of the Massachusetts line as having served more than three years from that State; and it is in proof that the petitioner's husband was a native of West Springfield, Massachusetts. It has likewise been ascertained that no other soldier, nor the widow or children of any other soldier, bearing the name of Elijah Bliss have ever applied to the Pension office for the benefits of any of the pension acts, a negative proof of considerable significance. But

however these facts may be, it is not doubted that the petitioner's second husband served as a volunteer among our French allies in the war of the revolution; that he enlisted under the Duke De Lauzun, at Strasbourg, in Alsace, for the American service, and came to this country with the Duke and the Count De Rochambeau, and was in many of the revolutionary battles fought after his arrival on our shores, and the only reason assigned by the Pension office for rejecting the petitioner's claim as the widow of Wolf is, that he "was a soldier serving in the French army, and only an ally."

Now, as the evidence is clear that after the termination of the war he remained here, conducting himself worthily in all respects as a citizen, contracting marriage with the present petitioner in 1800, and living with her till his death, in 1837, though technically the above-assigned reason may be sound, we think the practical allegiance of the second husband has been attested with such fidelity, no less in the *field* than in the *family*, that it is but a just and equitable application of the pension laws to award the relief provided in the accompanying bill.